

Interorganizational Relationships and Culture Transference

An Example of the Government as Stakeholder

Janet K. Tinoco^a and Anke Arnaud^b

College of Business, Embry Riddle Aeronautical University, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

^atinocoj@erau.edu ^barnauda@erau.edu

Abstract

Organizations are open-systems [1], which are interrelated with their environments, environments that include key stakeholders in their organizations. As a result, it is likely that stakeholders can have an effect on the evolution and transformation of organizations and their cultures, especially those influential stakeholders that have unique and strong relationships with their associated organizations.

This conceptual research is grounded in the principle that organizational culture can be the result of an organization's influence by and adaptation to important stakeholders in its environment. We are not aware of research that has investigated why and how culture transfers between organizations that lie outside their immediate industries or professional communities, yet there is some anecdotal evidence that the phenomenon occurs. We use an example of the United States (US) government, specifically the Department of Defense (DOD), as the critical customer stakeholder to organizations in the US defense industry, to propose our arguments on culture transference. We believe that the path for and likelihood of culture transference lie in the type, strength, and tenure of the relationship between stakeholder and focal organization. We propose that these three attributes can increase the likelihood of culture transference and the subsequent emergence in the focal organization(s).

Introduction

The literature suggests that organizational culture differs between industries [2, 3], professions, and occupational communities [4, 5, 6]. We define organizational culture as the widely shared and strongly held values by members of a social system [see 7, 8]. Yet, organizations are open-systems [1], which are interrelated with their environments beyond their immediate industries and communities. As a result, it is likely that stakeholders can have an effect on the evolution and transformation of organizations and their cultures, especially those influential stakeholders that have unique and strong relationships with their associated organizations. A stakeholder represents an individual or group who can affect or is affected by the actions, decisions, policies, or goals of the organization [9].

Organizations have to manage and maximize external stakeholder relationships and be responsive to their stakeholder needs and requirements. Past research on stakeholder relationships suggests that these relationships develop because stakeholders perceive they have similar values to organizations [10] and that some organizations view themselves as

interconnected with stakeholders through dyadic bonds, subsequently leading to shared norms and values [e.g., 11, 12].

While these research endeavors suggest organizations and stakeholders develop interconnected relationships, it does not inform us about the effect of those relationships on the emergence and evolution of organizational culture. More specifically, we are not aware of research that has investigated why and how culture transfers between organizations that lie outside their immediate industries or professional communities. We use an example of the United States (US) government, specifically the Department of Defense (DOD), as the critical customer stakeholder to organizations in the US defense industry, to propose our arguments on culture transference. While we acknowledge that in many settings culture transference can be bidirectional, we chose this particular relationship on which to base our initial exploratory research due to the uniqueness of the relationship and the influential nature of the customer stakeholder. In our research, the defense industry is comprised of non-government suppliers of research, development, production, and service of military equipment and facilities.

With this backdrop, our contribution is threefold. First, we draw from relevant theories to explain why and how culture transference occurs. Second, we discuss the customer stakeholder-organization relationship and its effect on the transfer and evolution of culture using an example of a unique stakeholder-organization relationship from a rarely studied industry. Third, we specifically propose that the conduit for and likelihood of culture transference lies in the type, strength, and tenure of the relationship between stakeholder and focal organization. Finally, we close our discussion with implications for management and suggestions for future research.

Literature review

Relevant Theories

In explaining the transference of military organizational culture from the DOD to organizations in the defense industry, we begin by discussing two literatures, resource dependence and organizational behavior, and their respective arguments as to why and how this phenomenon occurs. We then turn our focus to the phenomenon studied under our chosen context and then state general propositions of culture transference based on attributes of the stakeholder-organization relationship

Resource dependence theory recognizes the interdependence between stakeholder and focal organization and the desire for each party in the relationship to reduce dependence and uncertainty. It offers several explanations for the transference of organizational culture between these organizations. First, a focal organization will voluntarily alter its structure and behavior patterns to acquire and maintain needed, external resources [13]. This indicates that organizations may willingly modify their cultures when advantageous to increase access to valuable resources controlled by a stakeholder. Second, dependence and resource scarcity may induce cooperation between stakeholder and focal organization rather than “arm’s length” transactions and competitiveness. As customers provide the revenue for the sustainability and the success of profit-seeking organizations, they hold a special position among the focal organizations’ stakeholders. Because these organizations are dependent on customers, customers have power to affect the organization [14]. In lieu of power and control attempts over those customer stakeholders, focal organizations may resort to cooperation and build unique, not-easily imitated, and strong relationships with those key stakeholders that can provide scarce resources (funding, purchase of goods, etc.). These unique, strong relationships are more likely to lead to

the transfer of organizational cultures or cultural dimensions from stakeholder to focal organization. Third, outside of cooperative interorganizational relationships, strong stakeholders can use powerful tactics from its position in the environment to promote the same value system, seeking to control its resources through culture transference, particularly among organizations on which they are highly dependent.

With respect to organizational behavior research, Schein [15] explains that culture is socially constructed as founders surround themselves with people who share their values. Organizations attract and select individuals for employment who are perceived to have similar values to those of the organization and who fit the culture of the organization [8]. The fit or congruence between individual values and organizational values and culture benefits the organization and promotes performance and long-term sustainability [see 8, 16].

Adapting this argument to the organizational level, stakeholders may choose focal organizations that share the same values and culture or have the potential for *changing* their culture to match that of the stakeholders in order to maximize organization-to-organization fit. Greater fit may increase the ability of the stakeholder to influence the focal organization to meet its requirements and needs. On the other hand, the focal organization may be more successful if their culture and sense of reality matches the demands and needs of their key stakeholders. Research supports that organizations and the content of their cultures need to fit their environments and its stakeholders, and cultural patterns need to mirror environmental challenges [17].

Government, DOD, and Culture

Governments and their agencies influence all practices, action, policies and decisions of organizations via the public policy process [18]. Governments develop, implement and enforce the laws and regulations that frame how organizations do business. Yet, the government and its institutions can serve as important stakeholders in organizations beyond their regulatory influences.

As key customer of defense services and products, the DOD has an especially important stake in organizations from the defense industry. The strategic importance of stakeholders is determined by the contributions of the stakeholder to the environmental uncertainty facing the organization, the ability of the stakeholder to reduce environmental uncertainty for the organization, and the organization's strategic choice [19]. Organizations in the defense industry make the strategic choice to serve one key customer, the DOD. Therefore, the DOD contributes to and can reduce the environmental uncertainty of organizations from the defense industry. Harrison and St. John [19] suggest that partnering tactics help organizations to reduce this uncertainty by developing strong, stable and enduring relationships with strategically important stakeholders. Because of the DOD's unique position as the nation's key protector of security and defense against war, it is likely to represent a unique customer stakeholder who will seek to develop and control the relationships with organizations from the defense industry. As the DOD develops relationships with its suppliers, it is also probable that the DOD influences the operation and culture of those organizations. Specifically, the deeply-rooted, strong core cultural values of the military will affect interactions and transactions between the government stakeholder and focal organizations and find their way into the culture of those organizations.

These aforementioned strong core cultural values come from the fact that the DOD is a social institution with values and beliefs developed and nurtured to support the "management of violence" [20]. These values are instilled early in the soldier's career as part of basic training

and socialization into this unique organization [21] and bonded with rituals, symbols, and heroic stories [22]. More specifically, the military culture is highly structured and controlling, and embraces strict rank hierarchies [23] with the goal to “minimize the uncertainty of the battlefield,” [24, p. 6]. It is one that emphasizes the needs of society and country while considering the soldier’s rights secondary [23]. On the other hand, the cultural value of teamwork is salient in the military as unit cohesion and teamwork in the severest of circumstances and respect for comrades and loyalty to the group [20, 25, 26]. The culture is results-oriented and process-oriented. Reliable and error free performance in a team environment is required, otherwise catastrophes may occur [27]. The military culture can also be defined as detail oriented. For example, the highly intensive and complicated technologies of weaponry and military systems require an inordinate amount of detail and precision to work effectively under the severest of circumstances and prevent injury or death in military training, during development, manufacturing, and testing of products. Finally, the military culture clearly can be characterized as aggressive and competitive by the very task at hand, that is, war.

Interorganizational Relationships: The Conduit for Culture Transfer

The theories outlined earlier provide a foundation for why and generally how culture transference occurs, but do not address the specific mechanism in the interorganizational relationship that functions as a conduit for the dimensions of culture to move between organizations. We believe that the path for and likelihood of culture transference lie in the type, strength, and tenure of the relationship between stakeholder and focal organization. While we believe that all three attributes can contribute synergistically, we concentrate in this study on each attribute individually.

Type of Relationship

With respect to type, interorganizational relationships can be thought of as lying on a continuum anchored by non-cooperative arm’s length transactions on one end and cooperative networks, partnerships, and alliances on the other [28]. These relationships are often explored by the advantages they bring to both organizations in a dyadic relationship or to the organizations within the network [13, 29]. The established relationship between stakeholder and focal organization can take on multiple characteristics drawn from different points on this continuum ranging from coercive (non-negotiable contractual requirements, government laws, and the like) to cooperative and social relationships. We argue that the transfer and emergence of the culture is a result of (a) coercion through non-negotiable contractual requirements and dictations of law and (b) collaborations and social relationships that develop between stakeholder and focal organization(s).

Resource dependence theory states that depending on the level of resource dependence, an organization will seek to exercise control over resources and use its power to secure those scarce resources [30, 31]. This suggests powerful stakeholders, such as the DOD, have the ability to control and influence focal organizations in the defense industry. As the single most important customer, they control important resources, i.e., revenues that are important to the organizations’ sustainability. Berman et al. [14] identified that customers hold a key position among other stakeholders and affect an organization’s strategy. Stakeholders may use tactics grounded in their position in the environment to secure access to important resources. These tactics may include

coercive pressures that lead to the transfer of cultural values from stakeholder to focal organizations.

The relationship between the DOD and the focal organizations in the defense industry can be partially described as coercive. As necessitated by the DOD rules, laws and procedures, focal organizations implement tight US security controls in facilities, processes and procedures, to protect US classified (i.e. Confidential, Secret, Top Secret) information, hardware, and software from “landing in the wrong hands.” Furthermore, inappropriate employee conduct or lax discipline with respect to classified information may result in a number of punishments by the organization depending on severity of infraction: time off, job loss, and, possibly, federal penalty.

The military manage and control the suppliers of military products and services in a similar fashion as they control their soldiers, implicitly expecting and requiring discipline, military ethos, cohesion, and loyalty. They often direct their suppliers to implement similar management and control techniques in their organizations as a result of the highly unique requirements of the customer and the product. Compliance to copious military standards, processes, procedures, and regulations for product design, development, and test, as well as program management, financial reporting, and program planning, among other areas, are contractual requirements [32] that necessitate military-like discipline to implement. Thus, we posit:

Proposition 1: As the influence of the stakeholder increases via coercive relationships between stakeholder and focal organization, the likelihood of culture transference increases from stakeholder to focal organization.

Resource dependence theory suggests that as an alternative to seeking power and control, organizations may resort to cooperation and build unique relationships with those organizations that are needed for key and scarce resources. As stakeholders recognize their resource dependence on suppliers, they may become more cooperative and interact voluntarily with suppliers and build cohesive relationships instilling their values into the culture of those focal organizations. This process of cultural transference may be accelerated if normative isomorphic processes lead to the sharing of professionals across organizations. Organizations frequently hire professionals from other organizations in its fields to achieve a cognitive base and legitimize their organization. For example, often employees move among different firms within an industry, bringing with them social capital from previous employment [31], but they also bring the organizational culture of which they are accustomed.

The unique relationship between the DOD and the defense suppliers is becoming more intertwined as the government turns to outsourcing many key military functions. Focal organizations in the defense industry are actively performing tasks formerly restricted to military personnel, such as maintaining weapons systems, “piloting” unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), collecting and analyzing intelligence, and interrogating prisoners [33]. Not only are these organizations increasingly embedded with the military, but there is also constant military presence in the focal organization’s facilities and an on-going interchange of personnel between facilities during the design, development, test, and production of the military product. For the past 20 years, the US government has encouraged government-industry collaborations and cooperative assistance where typically personnel are traded between facilities to increase interactions [34]. These increasingly cooperative interactions in an environment highly characterized by warfare trigger a culture transfer from stakeholder to focal organization(s). Thus, we posit that

Proposition 2: As the influence of the stakeholder increases via cooperative relationships between stakeholder and focal organization, the likelihood of culture transference increases from stakeholder to focal organization.

In organizational behavior, the person-organization fit literature suggests that when individuals' values are congruent with those of the organization, organizational performance improves [16]. Raising this position to the organization level, customer stakeholders should select focal organizations that share the same values. Over time, as the relationship between organizations develops and deepens, it is likely that "organization-organization" value congruence emerges. As stated earlier, interactions between the organizations are ever-increasing as a result of a growing dependence and interlinkage of the DOD on its focal organizations (suppliers). Social relationships between DOD and suppliers easily develop under the stressful and pressing conditions of war where suppliers absorb the strong military culture as they work side-by-side with the military. Additionally, upon retirement a significant number of military personnel obtain civilian positions at their previous supplier's organizations [35, 36]. Clearly, the new member brings a deeply entrenched military culture along with a strong social tie back to the DOD. This social tie acts as a bridge between stakeholder and focal organization that allows entrance and hiring of additional ex-military by the organization. Since member demographics highly influence culture [3], the cultural effect of the ex-military employees in the defense organization grows with each new member added and the social tie is further strengthened. Moreover, the influx of ex-military into defense organizations can increase a sense of cooperation between parties with similar values and understandings.

Proposition 3: As the influence of the stakeholder increases via social relationships between stakeholder and focal organization, the likelihood of culture transference increases from stakeholder to focal organization.

Strength of Relationship

Relationship strength is defined as the extent or degree of closeness or strength of the relationship between the stakeholder and focal organization(s). It can differ within a single relationship type and may be higher in vertical integration and cooperative relationships than in arm's length transactions or coercive relationships [37]. Resource dependence theory suggests that organizations strive to increase power and control over limited resources [13, 31]. An alternative for gaining control and power is the development of strong relationships with those organizations critical for survival; especially applicable to organizational fields where the number of organizational participants is small. More specifically, key stakeholders can exercise their power by seeking to develop strong relationships with focal organizations by way of immersing their own cultural norms and values into those focal organizations.

The strength of the relationship between the stakeholder and focal organization can also be evaluated in terms of its enduring and unique market structure. A market structure represented by one major customer (stakeholder) and dominated by a few suppliers (focal organization(s)) creates significant resource interdependencies. When this limited number of customers and suppliers characterize an organizational field, these resource interdependencies will likely result in the development of strong, lasting relationships. Furthermore, it is likely that powerful stakeholders will engage in transactions with organizations that fit their needs, requirements, and view of reality. At the individual level, value congruence between employees and organizations will lead to positive organizational outcomes and stronger employee commitment [e.g., 16]. At the organizational level, it is likely that value congruence between organizations such as

stakeholder and focal organization(s) will increase the commitment of those organizations to the relationship. This will lead to the development of stronger, lasting relationships between organizations. For example, since value congruence is a key factor in the development of interorganizational relationships [10], its presence increases organization-organization fit, leading to decreased uncertainty and reduced complexity while increasing resource flow for both stakeholder and focal organization(s). When key stakeholders have significant control over other organizations in an organizational field, greater value fit may increase the ability of stakeholders to influence the values and cultures of focal organization(s). As such, we posit:

Proposition 4: As the relationship between stakeholder and focal organization strengthens the likelihood of culture transference from stakeholder to focal organization increases.

Tenure of the Relationship

Over time organizations learn from their environments and stakeholders. The longer an organization, such as a defense contractor, has a relationship with a key stakeholder, the DOD, the more likely it is that this organization adopts important cultural values of the military. We believe that as the recurrence and frequency of interactions between key stakeholders and focal organizations extend over longer periods of time, it is likely that focal organizations will learn from their stakeholders. They will develop shared perception of similar destiny, purpose, mutual interests, values and norms [38]. The adoption of those values and norms from key stakeholders will further cement the interorganizational relationship and increase culture homogeneity.

In our chosen context, the DOD and the focal organizations in the defense industry have had a long, enduring, and unique relationship since the middle of the last century; so much so that President Dwight D. Eisenhower coined the term, military-industrial complex, to capture the essence of the relationship [39]. The multiple interactions that have occurred over the years between the DOD and industry suppliers have built a strong pathway from which the military culture can be transferred. Whether the interactions have occurred based on arm's length transactions, collaborations, alliances, or strong social ties, we propose the tenure of this relationship contributes to culture transference:

Proposition 5: As the relationship between the stakeholder and focal organization ages, the likelihood of culture transference increases from the stakeholder to the focal organization.

Discussion and Managerial Implications

The sources of organizational culture are generally understood to be (1) the beliefs, assumptions, and values of an organization's founder, (2) the learning experiences of group members, and (3) new beliefs, values, and assumptions brought in by new members and leaders [15]. While some research exists to support that similar cultural dimensions develop across industries, little is known about the role of specific stakeholders, and the process by which they influence the development of organizational culture in and across organizations of a particular industry. This paper addresses this gap by developing explanations for how organizational culture can transfer from a stakeholder to focal organizations. More specifically, we suggest that different types of relationships such as coercive, cooperative or social networks will result in the transfer of culture from stakeholder to focal organizations within an organizational field and to a particular industry. Furthermore, the strength and tenure of the stakeholder-organization relationship are additional characteristics that can explain the transference of their culture. As

culture transfers from stakeholder to focal organizations, the industry as a whole may take on important, homogeneous cultural value dimensions.

Analyzing and understanding the nature of the relationships between two or more stakeholders and the effect this relationship has on organizational culture can help managers to look beyond interorganizational sources of cultures. Schein [15] suggests that organizations need to develop learning cultures characterized by a commitment to systemic thinking. As the world becomes more complex and interdependent, managers need to be able to think systematically and analyze forces that affect organizational culture [15]. Considering the effect of external environmental forces such as stakeholder influences on the emergence and change of organizational culture may present new opportunities and/or challenges to managers. Analyzing and understanding the relationship process and the stakeholder influences on one's culture may lead to the development of more productive relationships with key stakeholders. Also, managers who understand the scope and depth of their organization's culture and how it is influenced by external stakeholders are more likely to engage in recruitment and selection that will result in better employee-organization fit which in turn leads to stronger commitment, less turnover and ultimately higher organizational performance [8].

Furthermore, understanding the dynamics of stakeholder-organization relationships and the key cultural dimensions that define the various stakeholders should result in improved understanding, communication and coordination with those stakeholders. It may present a benefit for managers who identify key stakeholders and know that the development and maintenance of key stakeholder relationship resides in the ability to develop a cultural fit between their organizations' cultures. This seems to be especially important before organizations engage in mergers, acquisitions, alliances or joint ventures or organizational fields with limited numbers of participants. Overall, managers who understand their own organizational cultures and those of their stakeholders are able to manage interactions and relationships with those stakeholders more effectively. They can address the needs of those stakeholders and reduce conflict by developing cohesive working relationships.

While we focus on the relationship between the customer stakeholder and organizations across a specific industry, it is reasonable to assume that this research may transcend to other stakeholder-organization relationships. We hope that our efforts will lead other researchers in culture to seek out and shed light on the "whys and hows" of culture transference between organizations.

References

1. Katz, D. and Kahn, R., (1966), *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
2. Gordon, G., (1985), "The Relationship of corporate culture to industry sector and corporate performance." In M. J. S. R.H. Kilmann, R. Serpa and Associates (Ed.), *Gaining Control of the Corporate Culture*, pp: 103-125. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
3. Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Daval Ohayv, D. and Sanders, G., (1990), "Measuring organizational cultures; A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35, pp: 218-316.
4. Barley, S., (1986), "Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observations of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 31, pp: 78-108.
5. Bloor, G. and Dawson, P., (1994), "Understanding professional culture in organization context", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 15, pp: 275-295.

6. van Maanen, J. and Barley, S., (1984), "Occupational communities: Culture and control in organizations", In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, pp: 287-365. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
7. Chatman, J. and Jehn, K., (1994), "Assessing the relationship between industry characteristics and organizational culture: How different can you be?" *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp: 522-553.
8. O'Reilly, C., Chatman, J. and Caldwell, D., (1991), "People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 34, No.3, pp: 487-516.
9. Carroll, A. and Buchholz, A., (2008), *Business and society: Ethics and stakeholder management*. 7th ed. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.
10. Voss, G., Cable, D. and Voss, Z. , (2000.) "Linking organizational values to relationships with external constituents: A study of nonprofit professional theatres", *Organization Science*, Vol. 11, pp: 330-347.
11. Baumeister, R. and Leary, M. , (1995), "The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 117, No.3, pp: 497.
12. Brickson, S. , (2007), "Organizational identity orientation: The genesis if the role of the firm and distinct forms of social value", *American Management Review*, Vol. 32, pp: 864-888.
13. Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G., (1978), *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.
14. Berman, S., Wicks, A., Kotha, S. and Jones, T., (1999), "Does stakeholder orientation matter? The relationship between stakeholder management models and firm financial performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 42, pp: 488-506.
15. Schein, E., (2004), *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 3rd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
16. Kristof, A. , (1996), "Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 49, No.1, pp: 1.
17. Kotter, J. and Heskett, J. , (1992), *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: Free Press.
18. Bucholz, R. and Rosenthal, S., (2004), "Stakeholder theory and public policy: How governments matter", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 52, pp: 143-153.
19. Harrison, J. and St. John, C., (1996), "Managing and partnering with external stakeholders", *The Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 10, pp: 46-60.
20. Snider, D., (1999), "An uninformed debate on military culture", *Orbis*, Vol. 43, No.1: 11-26.
21. Carpenter, M., (2006), *Army Organizational Culture of Innovation: A Strategic Imperative for Transformation*. US Army War College, Carlisle, PA, 22.
22. Dunivin, K., (1994), "Military culture: Change and continuity", *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol. 20, pp: 531-547.
23. Janowitz, M., (1959), "Changing patterns of organizational authority: The military establishment", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No.4, pp: 473-493.
24. Ault, R., (2003), *Encouraging risk and embracing uncertainty*. US Army School of Advanced Military Studies, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 52.
25. Moskos, C. , (1976), "The Military", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 2, pp: 55-77.

26. Segal, D. and Segal, M. , (1983), "Change in military organization", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 9, pp: 151-170.
27. Weick, K. and Roberts, K. , (1993), "Collective mind in organizations: Heedful interrelating on flight decks", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 38, No.3, pp: 357-381.
28. Gulati, R., (1995), "Social structure and alliance formation patterns: A longitudinal analysis", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 40, pp: 619-652.
29. Kogut, B., (1988), "Joint ventures: Theoretical and empirical perspectives", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 9, pp: 319-332.
30. Mizuchi, M. and Yoo, M., (2002), "Interorganizational power and dependence", In J. A. C. Baum (Ed.), *Companion to Organizations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
31. Pfeffer, J., (1982), "The external control of organizations", In J. C. Baum (Ed.), *Organizations and Organization Theory*, pp: 178-207. Boston: Pitman.
32. Augustine, N., (1983), *Augustine's Laws and Major System Development Programs*. New York: American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc.
33. Watson, B., (2006), *A Look Down the Slippery Slope: Domestic Operations, Outsourcing, and the Erosion of Military Culture*. Air University Press, Maxwell Air Force Base Alabama.
34. Linton, J., Lombana, C. and Romig, J., (2001), "Accelerating technology transfer from federal laboratories to the private sector--The business development wheel", *Engineering Management Journal*, Vol. 13, No.3, pp: 15-33.
35. Lieberman, S., (1971), "An empirical study of military-industrial linkages", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 76, No.4, pp: 562-584.
36. Schoenberger, E., (1997), *The Cultural Crisis of the Firm*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
37. Golicic, S. , Foggin, J. and Mentzer, J. , (2003), "Relationship magnitude and its role in interorganizational relationship structure", *Journal of Business Logistics*, Vol. 24, No.1, pp: 57-75.
38. Jones, C., Hesterly, W. and Borgatti, S., (1997), "A general theory of network governance: exchange conditions and social mechanisms", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 22, No.4, pp: 911-945.
39. Eisenhower, D., (1961), "Farewell address to the nation", *Public Papers of the Presidents*. pp: 1035-1040.
40. Oliver, A., (1990), "Determinants of interorganizational relationships: Integration and future directions", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 15, pp: 241-265.